SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

26th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXVI, No. 8 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © May 1, 1996

Budget Deal Raises Hopes That the Worst is Over

Too early to say for sure, but after a bad year and a half for research affairs in Washington, bits of evidence suggest the beginning of a recovery. Money is the principal measure, and it's been rising in places where it seemed sure to fall.

Last week, a House-Senate conference committee provided an extra $40 million of "add back" funds that the White House requested for the National Science Foundation. With that money, which is for the present fiscal year, the NSF budget will rise about 2 percent above last year's level. That means a loss to inflation, but given the budgetary war whoops of the newly elected Republican majority last year, the numbers belie the generally gloomy expectations.

Reversing an earlier wipe-out decision, the budget conferees have agreed to provide money for the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) in the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The agreed figure, also for the current fiscal year, is $221 million. That's miserly in comparison to the White House request for $491 million, and the new funding requires advanced notification to Congress about future plans for the program. But ATP—reviled by Republican ideologists as corporate welfare and pork—has survived intense efforts at its elimination, at least for the remainder of this fiscal year. Symbolically, it's big win for the White House.

GAO Probes Science Lobbying—P. 3

Pay Check: Academy of Sciences—P. 5

The National Institutes of Health, always a special case in the politics of research funding, came out of last year's budget mayhem with a respectable 5.7 percent increase. Its friends in the health lobbies and in Congress are now confidently aiming for a 6.5 percent increase.

Originally slated for huge spending cuts and curbs on its regulatory powers, the Environmental Protection Agency is on the rebound with a trifling 1 percent cut.

Similar good fortune does not extend to all research agencies. NASA, for example, remains in a slump, but officials there are expressing optimism that the agency has hit bottom financially. Indications of a changing mood in Washington are evident in the Republicans' waning fervor for abolishing cabinet departments. The first on the list, Commerce, has now probably been rendered invincible by the death of Secretary Ron Brown. If he had perished of natural causes on the golf course, matters might be different. But, as a grieving President Clinton stressed in a casket-side eulogy, Secretary Brown died in the line of duty, leaving the Department as his memorial.

Of late, the terminators have been quiet about the other Departments on their list—Energy, Education and Labor, none considered in danger today.

The surviving departments and the government's science and technology agencies are clearly benefiting from yet another feat of political self-resurrection by wily Bill Clinton. He did it this time by depicting the Congressional Republican majority as destructive toward government's good works in behalf of the elderly, environmental purity, high-tech employment, education, and safe streets. Polls show that in all those categories, Clinton ranks ahead of Senator Bob Dole, the leading contender for his job, while House Speaker Newt Gingrich's ratings are in the dumps.

Clinton's vetoes of Republican spending bills are as much to blame for last winter's government shutdowns as

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

NSF was ordered to eliminate one of its seven directorates in the Omnibus Science Bill passed by the House Science Committee last week—and there's no doubt that the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate is the target of the legislation's chief author, Committee Chairman Robert Walker (R-Pa.). Walker, accusing the social sciences of political correctness, called for the Directorate's abolition last year, but backed off under fire, which is sure to come again.

The University of Rochester's recent turnabout on its decision to abolish its graduate math program also demonstrates that it pays to howl. The abolition move aroused the American Mathematical Society, which seeded the press with harsh criticisms of Rochester. To keep the heat on, AMS set up a Rochester Task Force. Though math has now been declared safe at Rochester, the AMS Council voted on April 17 to expand the group into the Mathematics Advocacy Task Force, with a mandate to monitor Rochester for two more years and work on "broader issues."

At the strife-torn National Academy of Engineering, they will be counting the votes this week on a month-long mail ballot to add a recall provision to the NAE bylaws. The measure is aimed at President Harold Liebowitz and, if approved, a second vote would be required on the question of stay or leave. Meanwhile, the academicians of the engineering sciences have cast their votes in the regular biennial election for NAE's number two post, Chairman. Winner: Alan Lovelace, a retired aerospace executive. The current Chairman, Norman Augustine, CEO of Lockheed Martin, declined to run in a contested election. Entered by backers as a write-in candidate, he lost, 645-368. The count is seen as a good sign for Liebowitz.

. . . Gibbons Discounts Reality of Far-Off Budget Plan

(Continued from Page 1)

the policies and reductions in the bills that he deemed offensive. But, with the President casting himself as protector of the public interest, and Gingrich carrying on in his customary truculent fashion, the public blamed the Republicans. They have since been unraveling as a cohesive political force and are on the defensive about their legislative agenda.

The economic and political reality in all this is that Clinton and company have scored public relations gains by pirating the Republican's anti-government rhetoric. "The era of big government is over," Clinton declared in his State of the Union address. He's now in harmony with the other side on balancing the federal budget by the year 2002, though previously he said a few more years should be added to the timetable.

In any case, the President has successfully deployed an image of his Administration as committed to frugality and generosity. The task of publicly explaining and defending this paradox as it applies to research was recently confronted by Clinton's Assistant for Science and Technology, John Gibbons.

The forum for this performance, April 17, was the annual presentation of talks and briefings that the American Association for the Advancement of Science holds on the federal R&D budget. As background for the *apparatchiks* who come from far and wide for enlightenment, the AAAS customarily prepares a thick book of budget analyses. However, with large sections of this year's budget still in limbo at that point, the analyses were confined to a brief, preliminary report that, in sum, conveyed a simple message: Clinton's spending plans to the year 2002 would reduce nondefense R&D spending by 11.7 percent, while the Republican Budget Resolution would reduce it by 33 percent.

The assessment noted, however, that the Republican-controlled Congress "has departed significantly from its own blueprint," and that appropriations this year, "are much higher than the funding levels in the Budget Resolution."

But under either plan, said Al Teich, head of the AAAS Science and Policy Directorate, "the downward slope in the future years will have negative consequences for the nation's future. If these projections are actually realized," he warned, "research in universities, federal labs and industry will face a potentially dire situation."

Knowing the numbers intimately, Gibbons was prepared for the AAAS assessment, which, in effect, concluded that his Administration is only less worse than the Republicans in its treatment of R&D.

The Clinton Administration's pro-research policies are confirmed by its budget record, he said, noting that the budget for next year "proposes $14 billion for fundamental research, an increase of $278 million, 2 percent over 1996." That, of course, works out to a loss of purchasing power, but, without mentioning it, the speaker 'sped on, extolling the President for supporting science in difficult times and scolding his audience for fixating on the far-off year 2002.

"What I'm wary of in this forum today, though," Gibbons explained, "is the temptation to be drawn into the discussion of theoretical events in a distant future. And anyone who's ever worked on the federal budget-setting exercise knows that the year 2002 might as well be a century away for all our ability to accurately predict the details of federal spending that far out."

While the AAAS gathering is focusing on the imponderables of 2002, he continued, Congress is preparing a new Budget Resolution that could savage R&D spending in the coming fiscal year. "Yet today, given this grim scenario, we are arguing about what science we'll be funding in 2002.

"Friends," Gibbons said plaintively, "I'm honestly much more worried about what we'll be able to do in FY '97 than I am about FY 2002." Speaking prior to last week's budget deal, he said, "Congress still hasn't given us an FY '96 budget; my agency, OSTP [Office of Science and Technology Policy], and many research agencies are still struggling along on week-to-week stopgap funding arrangements. Research commitments, appointments, and personnel actions are on hold. Widespread furloughs, layoffs, and program terminations are predicted. Morale is not what I would describe as upbeat.

"The bottom line is that we are in the middle of a crisis *this year* and *this month*. I don't know what 2002 will bring. Neither does the Congress, neither does the AAAS," Gibbons declared.

Gibbons' performance apparently had an intimidating effect on the audience. A brief question period brought only soft inquiries, none about the Clinton Administration's long-term spending plans or the effects of inflation on the claimed increases in research support for next year.

He's right, of course, in stressing that 2002 is beyond forecast in the American political system. The only issue that counts at present, now that the 1996 budget has been passed—seven months late—is completion of Congressional work on the President's proposals for 1997.

Again, it's too early to be sure, but the universally gloomy forecasts for federal science and related activities of just a few

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1996, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Relf

Circulation Manager
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $490.00 (two years, $840.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

Rep. Brown Calls for Intensified Science Lobbying

(Continued from Page 2)

months ago now appear to be a bit less justified.

However, the atmospheric change, slight as it may be, does not seem to have registered on the establishment. At a meeting of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology on April 19, Frank Press, retired President of the National Academy of Sciences, discussed his prescription for hard times, *Allocating Federal Funds for Science and Technology*.

Reviewing the criticisms that have been raised since the report was issued in November, Press told of being advised, " 'Don't accept austerity. Fight for increases.'

"I'm not against that," Press told the Council, "but I'm not going to lead that fight."

Meanwhile, on Capitol Hill, Rep. George Brown (D-California), former Chairman of what is now called the House Science Committee, reacted to the AAAS budget analysis with a call to battle. The Republican budget and the President's version are both inadequate, though the President's is less inadequate, he conceded.

"The only way the numbers are going to improve above the President's projections," Brown said, "is if the R&D community and the public give members [of Congress] and the President a reason to change them.

"As of now," Brown continued, "the community is making inadequate efforts to educate the public and politicians about the stakes of these programs and making only weak efforts to get involved in the process of setting budget priorities."

The gloomy view expressed by Brown, an old trumpeteer for large-scale lobbying by the scientific community, is only partially justified. Ever since the Republicans stated their drastic budget-cutting plans last year, record numbers of scientists have been making the rounds of Congress to urge support for their favorite programs and agencies. As related in the adjacent column, these intense, and apparently successful, efforts have now drawn a counterpunch from the Republican leadership.

However, the scientific lobbying efforts are still pretty tame stuff in comparison to real political warfare on the Washington scene. The scientists are, in effect, saying no more than, "Be kind to us because it's good for the country, and it's also beneficial for your constituents."

The appeals are not accompanied by the wherewithal of politics, campaign contributions and volunteer sevices, nor do they deal in the flip side of politiking—threats of electoral retribution for failure to be kind.

Nonetheless, the traditional appeals have apparently produced beneficial results. A cautious and highly tentative assessment now common around the science-policy circuit in Washington is that, maybe, the funding decline has gone as far as it's going to go. With long-term plans calling for further reductions, no one is saying that publicly. But it's whispered.—DSG

GAO Probes Lobbying

Are federal research agencies going overboard in stirring up public support for their budgets and work?

Chairman Robert Walker (R-Pa.) of the House Science Committee has asked the General Accounting Office (GAO), the investigative service for Congress, to look into the drum-beating activities of four agencies under his jurisdiction: the Department of Energy, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Science Foundation and NASA.

The GAO inquiry, now under way and due for completion in about two months, coincides with many appeals—from in and out of government—for scientists to lobby Congress and stir up the public in support of science.

Walker's interest includes the agencies' Congressionally approved public-affairs offices, which routinely produce press releases, brochures and other promotional material for public consumption.

But he's especially interested, SGR hears, in whether funds appropriated for research are being diverted to lobbying, either openly or in the guise of public-information and -education programs.

Exhortations to visit Capitol Hill and buttonhole their Senators and Congressmen in behalf of R&D spending mobilized hordes of scientists last year. With rare exception, they were there to protest Republican-backed spending cuts in research.

The potential specifications for the GAO inquiry are extremely broad. A GAO memo on the "Proposed scope of our review," prepared for discussion with Walker's Committee, states that "The Following Activities Would be Included in Our Review," and it goes on to specify "Dissemination of information to the general public through" advertisements on radio, TV and in print media (with job ads excluded), "Official ceremonies," "Press releases, briefings and ceremonies," "Press releases aimed at the general public: preparation, printing, and distribution," and "Tours for the public: for example, Kennedy and Johnson Space Centers." Public-relations activities of contractor-operated laboratories would be included.

The GAO memo suggests the exclusion of scientific meetings, internal communications at agencies, and preparation and printing of scientific publications.

At this point, all that's going on is an inquiry inspired by a Congressman who is retiring at the end of this year. The whole thing could blow over without a trace. On the other hand, Congressional Republicans have taken a public-relations beating. They have the votes to crack down on promotional activities they regard as politically damaging to their cause.

A White House Science Conference? Don't Bet on It

The infrequent meetings of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) are usually placid, public bull sessions of no discernible consequence on policy or politics.

The latest, the fifth since Bill Clinton established PCAST two years ago, continued that tradition on April 18-19, though with one minor deviation in the proceedings: A bit of tension over a proposal to prod the President into championing academic research via a White House conference—an extravaganza cherished by interest groups as the ultimate public stage.

The PCAST Panel on Research Universities, headed by Judith Rodin, President of the University of Pennsylvania, and Charles Vest, President of MIT, reported that the fiscal situation in that sector of academe is becoming grim. "The overall investment in R&D in real dollars is declining," Rodin said, and producing harmful effects on staffing and the conduct of academic science. Vest warned that "a wedge is being driven between research and education" by rising costs that are sending academic researchers out into the marketplace to drum up financial support.

What's needed, said Rodin, is "a high level of Presidential advocacy," including, possibly, a White House conference on science and technology. Offering a draft letter embodying these views, Rodin and Vest asked for endorsement by the full PCAST of 19 members. "We don't need another report," Rodin said in reference to a Bush Administration report on academic research. She and Vest emphasized that they were seeking conspicuous Presidential support.

Strong backing was expressed by several members, including Norman Augustine, CEO of Lockheed Martin, who described the proposed White House conference as "one of the most important things PCAST can do." Augustine noted that research "budgets are being cut in companies, almost without exception," and that "despite heroic efforts, universities are under pressure."

The proponents of a White House conference, or some other publicly visible sign of major Presidential interest, argued that the nation's academic research strength is dribbling away without evidence of Presidential concern.

However, skepticism toward the Rodin-Vest prescription was expressed by Murray Gell-Mann, Nobel laureate of Caltech and the Santa Fe Institute. "The utility of White House conferences is not so great," he said.

Doubt was also expressed by Shirley M. Malcolm, Head of the Directorate for Education and Human Resources Programs at the American Association for the Advancement of Science. "A big conference might not be the mechanism just yet," she said, suggesting that research should first be conducted on the extent of the problems in academe and their origin.

Coming during the first day's session, the Rodin-Vest proposal was put off to the second day by John Gibbons, the President's Science and Technology Advisor, who co-chairs the Council with John Young, retired CEO of Hewlett-Packard.

On the second day of the meeting, as is usually the case with PCAST assemblages, many members did not attend, including Rodin, Vest and Augustine, plus a half dozen others who had made up a nearly full complement on the previous day. The proposed letter from PCAST to the President was not mentioned during the proceedings, but references to the suggested White House conference were made by two science-policy veterans on hand to address PCAST on other subjects, Frank Press, former President of the National Academy of Sciences, and Erich Bloch, former Director of NSF.

Press, who served as President Carter's Science Advisor, recalled, "When I was in the White House, we were nervous about White House conferences." They're useful, he said, if they harmonize with the President's priorities, but Press appeared cool to the current recommendation.

Bloch said the condition and future of academic research warranted "a bottom-up and top-down review to corral energy and focus attention." This would not necessarily entail a White House conference, he said, "but we need a dialog to bring all the parties together."

When SGR asked Gibbons about the Rodin-Vest proposal, he said their draft letter would be reviewed and a final version would be discussed with PCAST's members by fax and phone.

A White House staff member provided SGR with additional perspective on the matter, as follows: Having recognized the folly of scattering his Presidential prestige and time on numerous causes, large and small, Bill Clinton is now thriving in the polls by focusing on just a few, namely, jobs, welfare reform, environment, crime, and not much else. The staffer indicated that it is extremely unlikely that prior to the election, Clinton would add the sliver issue of university science to the list. And post-election, he said, is too far off and uncertain for any predictions.

The President did have an opportunity recently to sing out in support of research—National Science and Technology Week, April 21-27, sponsored by the National Science Foundation, with appropriate events at research facilities and schools throughout the country.

However, he did not display any gusto for the occasion, which was marked by a drab White House statement offering "Warm greetings to all my fellow Americans who are observing National Science and Technology week...."

The statement, worked over by many hands before its release on April 12, declared that "Science and technology are fascinating fields, but more important, they are critical to assuring the long-term success of our nation." The President added, "I encourage all Americans, and especially our young people, to participate in the different demonstrations, contests, and projects occurring in conjunction with National Science and Technology Week."

Non-Profit Pay Checks

Continuing with SGR's newly resumed series of reports on salaries and other data, derived from publicly available tax filings of major non-profit organizations in research and higher education. The previous report, in SGR of April 15, was on the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

National Academy of Sciences

With their biggest customer, the US government, committed to frugality, a revenue slump has settled upon the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and its junior partners in the Academy complex, the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) and the Institute of Medicine (IOM). Some staff reductions have ensued. Nonetheless, the Academy's most recent tax filing, for 1994, shows senior salaries still at the upper end of the non-profit scale. And there have even been a few plump increases.

As honorific institutions, the three wings supposedly embody the elites of their respective professions. But in its day-to-day operations, the tripartite organization is essentially a think tank with hired hands working on policy studies and various projects for federal agencies. For legal and tax purposes, what's commonly referred to as "the Academy" is the Academy of Sciences, chartered by Congress in 1863.

The 1994 tax return was filed in February 1996—a time gap resulting from extensions routinely granted by the IRS. Covering the NAS fiscal year ending June 30, 1995, it reports that gifts, grants, and contributions fell from $201 million in 1991 to $177 million in 1993, and then rose to $183 million in 1994.

Bruce Alberts, President of the Academy of Sciences, was paid $321,984, plus $38,914 in benefits. In the 1993 report, covering Alberts' first year as President, his salary was $265,502, with benefits of $26,751.

The then-President of the National Academy of Engineering, Robert White, who retired last July, was listed for a salary of $306,630 and $31,270 in benefits on the 1994 return. In 1993, he received $276,000 and $31,910. The salary of his successor, Harold Liebowitz, will first show up on the Academy's next return, for 1995.

Deemed unworthy of confidence by the Academy of Sciences, and later by his own Academy [SGR, March 1, April 15], Liebowitz has been deprived of his powers and salary as Vice Chairman of the National Research Council (NRC), the working arm of the Academies and the IOM, according to an NAS announcement. SGR is advised, however, that the amount withheld—reportedly about half his NAE income—is being made up to him by the National Academy of Engineering Fund, "a holding entity for independent assets and operating funds" of the NAE.

As President of the Academy of Sciences, Alberts is eligible for a car and driver, a perk used by his predecessor. Alberts used the car but dispensed with the driver upon becoming NAS President in July 1993. In April 1994, he dispensed with the company car, according to the Academy spokesperson. The President of the Academy of Engineering is also eligible for a car, the spokesperson said, but instead hires a car and driver for specific occasions.

Alberts resides in an Academy-owned apartment at the Watergate, one of Washington's costliest addresses. The Academy spokesperson told SGR that Alberts pays 50 percent, or $1400, of the condominium fee. He is not otherwise charged for the housing, she said, and it is "not included in his compensation."

The 1994 return shows that the head of the third wing of the Academy, Kenneth Shine, President of the Institute of Medicine, was paid $306,000, plus $37,373 in benefits; the 1993 figures are $290,000 and $37,518. He rates neither car nor pad.

The part-time status of other Science Academy officers listed on the return is reflected in lower pay and benefits:

Jack Halpern (University of Chicago), Vice President: $45,241, no benefits.

Peter Raven (Missouri Botanical Garden), Home Secretary: $109,576, no benefits.

F. Sherwood Rowland (UC Irvine), Foreign Secretary, $77,096; $6164 benefits.

Mildred Dresselhaus (MIT), Treasurer, $53,934, no benefits.

Also listed are the five highest-paid employes, with salary and benefits on the 1994 return as follows:

David Williams, who retired last year as Senior Financial Advisor, $356,103, including $184,102 in "severance pay," plus $20,331 in benefits. On the 1993 return, Williams' salary was $156,261.

Suzanne Woolsey, Chief Operations Officer, $188,262; $29,203.

Archie Turner, Chief Financial Officer, $178,338; $13,703.

William Colglazier, Executive Officer, $174,955; $29,985.

Jim Wright, General Counsel, $171,817; $28,023.

The Watergate condo-fee payment for the apartment of Academy of Sciences President Alberts is another sore point in the antagonisms between NAE President Liebowitz and virtually all the rest of the Academy complex. The NAE does not provide housing for its President. But, according to the Academy spokesperson, Liebowitz personally owns a Watergate apartment. Apparently he felt that he, too, is entitled to a condo-fee subsidy.

The spirit of the matter is evident in a memo last September from Alberts to Liebowitz, turning down his request for a meeting about "payment of your [i.e., Liebowitz's] condominium fees."

Alberts' memo states: "As we have previously discussed, this fee is not an appropriate expense for either the NAS or the NRC. According to my understanding, reinforced by a detailed analysis of the NAE statutes by [NAS counsel] Jim Wright, any decision regarding the payment of your condominium fee is the responsibility of the NAE Council." That being the case, Alberts concluded, a meeting would be pointless.

Next: American Chemical Society

In Quotes: Harsh Words on Overselling Science

From an address, "Behind the Endless Frontier," by Maxine Singer, President of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, April 17 to the annual Science and Technology Policy Colloquium of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

•

Another thing we could do [to increase public understanding of science] is to stop speaking with certainty about uncertain things. Scientists do not do that among themselves; it is both disrespectful and dumb to do it when speaking to nonscientists.... If the public does not understand probability and thus risk, it is our job to teach, not to wring our hands over public ignorance.... In the face of uncertainty, we have to be honest and outspoken.

Too many people have experienced science only in classes that are dogmatic about science and present it as a body of unassailable facts. We know better. Everyone should. When pertinent available scientific facts are insufficient to support a firm conclusion and policy must nevertheless be made, we should stop presenting opposing views as either/or options and stop waffling about holes in scientific knowledge. We should point out that substantial scientific disagreements indicate uncertainty and that in the end, neither view may be correct, or perhaps even both will be. We should not permit political pressures to back us into scientifically indefensible corners....

We should work with those who oppose a scientifically bad policy. Rather than worrying about the effects of such opposition on our own funding, we should speak out whenever wrongheaded ideas are headed for success. A recent example is the funding of research [by NIH] on alternative medicine....

Conflicts between religious ideas and modern science raise profoundly difficult questions. Many scientists are tempted to ignore religious sensibilities or worse, dismiss them. But they will not go away readily. They must be taken seriously because they are strongly felt by decent people. Respectful, informative responses are needed, if science is to retain the public's support. Denial is never constructive.

There is some wisdom in the public inclination to move cautiously when social assumptions that have worked productively for millennia are being challenged. For instance, modern genetics poses some tough societal issues. They need to be thoroughly and widely discussed before we can find reasonable and acceptable ways to apply the new science for the benefit of all....

If we are to improve the communication of science to those behind the frontier, the scientific community probably needs to recapture access to the public. Public information about science is now, to a large extent, in the hands of institutional public-relations departments, the science-policy establishment, that is yourselves [in the colloquium audience], and the media. We need a more direct line. We need to show that we are real, actually quite ordinary people....

If we can get a direct line, we will probably have to clean up our act. Too often these days, when scientists are given an opportunity to speak about their work, they are more interested in advancing the cause of their next grant, or their company's financial status, than in conveying information to the public.... There is too much hype. Every gene that is discovered will lead to a cure for cancer. Maybe, but not for a long time. Even the Superconducting Super Collider was said to have important implications for improving human health.

Job Changes & Appointments

At the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP): ***Jerry M. Melillo***, co-Director of the Ecosystems Center of the Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Mass., is the likely successor to ***Robert T. Watson***, Associate Director for Environment, who's moving to the World Bank. ***Keri-Ann Jones***, formerly with the Agency for International Development, is under consideration for OSTP Associate Director for National Security and International Affairs. She's been serving on an acting basis as successor to ***Jane Wales***, now with the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Both OSTP appointments are still in the White House review maze. If approved, the next required steps are Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation. The latter is usually routinely voted for OSTP nominees, but only after the nominations have idled in the Senate for several months.

Lyle Bivens, head of the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) in the Department of Health and Human Services, retired March 31, after 33 years of federal service. Bivens headed ORI since 1993 and held senior posts in the predecessor organization dealing with scientific misconduct. His tenure coincided with many tumultuous events in federal policing of research, including the so-called Baltimore case, still awaiting an appeals decision, the Gallo case, and repeated collisions with the once-formidable Congressman John Dingell. While a search goes on, ORI is headed on an acting basis by ***Chris B. Pascal***, Director of the Division of Research Investigations.

Harry S. Hertz has been appointed Director of the Office of Quality Programs in the National Institute of Standards and Technology, a post he's held on an acting basis since ***Curt Reimann*** retired in December. The Office manages the competition for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, the big federal prize for industrial performance awarded annually by the Commerce Department.

Correction: ***M.R.C. Greenwood,*** formerly with the Office of Science and Technology Policy, is moving to the post of Chancellor of UC Santa Cruz from the UC Davis campus, not from UC Riverside, as reported in SGR April 15.

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

on NIST's other big industrial-aid scheme, the Advanced Technology Program (ATP). Why the difference, when both programs conflict with opposition to government in the marketplace? ATP is a transient program, providing awards for a few years, mostly to small firms, while MEP now consists of some 60 centers, with staffs, local connections, hopes for permanence, and a national association, the Modernization Forum, based in Ann Arbor, which employs a Washington lobbyist. The MEP report was requested by a friend of NIST, Rep. Constance Morella, a Republican whose district, in Maryland's heavily Democratic Montgomery County, next-door to Washington, DC, includes NIST and the National Institutes of Health.

European Union Drug Approval: Overview of European Medicines Evaluation Agency and Approval Process (GAO/HEHS-96-71; 21 pp.), describes the drug-approval procedures adopted by the 15-nation European Union—involving centralized and decentralized reviews—but notes that the system has been in effect for only one year, and says it's too early to evaluate its workings. The report was requested by Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-Kansas), Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. A related report, ***Medical Device Regulation: Too Early to Assess European System's Value as Model for FDA*** (GAO/HEHS-96-65), was issued in March.

DOD Research: Acquiring Research by Nontraditional Means (GAO/NSIAD-96-11; 22 pp.), reports favorably on the effects of legislative revisions in recent years that have enabled the Pentagon to enter into cooperative research agreements, including with for-profit firms. The GAO says the guidelines and accounting methods could be clearer, but concludes that the statutory changes "have contributed to reducing some of the barriers between the defense and civilian industrial bases." The report was requested by the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

From the Consortium of Social Science Associations:

COSSA Washington Update: Proposed Fiscal Year 1997 Budgets for Social and Behavioral Science Research (36 pp., $10), annual edition providing analysis and budget proposals for the social and behavioral research programs proposed by the White House for virtually all federal agencies in the coming fiscal year. Though published just prior to the White House-Congress budget agreement last week, the report usefully tracks the trends and major issues. COSSA, which represents the main social and behavioral professional associations, plus many affiliated organizations, publishes *Washington Update* 22 times per year. (Individual subscriptions, $65; institutional, $130; add $130 for overseas mail).

Order from: COSSA, 1522 K St. NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/842-3525; fax 202/842-2788.

Science Council Catalog

The National Science and Technology Council (NSTC), comprising heads of all federal departments and agencies with substantial R&D programs, has issued a catalog, with ordering instructions, of about 40 publications prepared under its sponsorship over the last couple of years, plus other government documents related to its work. The quality ranges from ephemeral policy puffing to substantive reports on space debris, the federal role in construction research, infectious diseases, and a few others. IN PRINT has taken note of much of this output.

The list, entitled ***NSTC-Related Publications***, is available without charge from: Executive Secretary, National Science and Technology Council, Old Executive Office Building, Room 435, Washington, DC 20502; tel. 202/456-6100; fax 202/456-6026.

Most of the publications are also accessible through the home page of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP): http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/EOP/OSTP/html/OSTP_Home.html

From the American Institute of Physics (AIP):

Physics News in 1995 (72 pp., $5 for first copy; $3 each for more; check payable to AIP; add $2.75 if billing is required), the 26th in AIP's annual retrospective on research, with summaries of developments in all the major and minor fields of physics, 17 in all, from acoustics to vacuum and interface physics, plus a report on the 1995 Nobel Prize in physics. Phillip F. Schewe was the Editor, and Ben P. Stein the Assistant Editor.

Order from: American Institute of Physics, c/o AIDC, PO Box 20, Williston, Vermont 05495-0020; tel. 1-800/809-2247 or 802/862-0095.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, $490.00 ☐
two years, $840.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, $40.00 per year; non-USA surface mail, $20.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill
Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp.date _____

_____
Signature

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

From the Department of Energy, Laboratory Operations Board:

Draft Strategic Laboratory Missions Plan (Volume I, 90 pp.; Volume II, 159 pp.; no charge), "a direct response" to critical evaluations of the DOE lab system, this one says most everything is okay in the sprawling research empire, and where it isn't, correctives are on track, including a 10 percent reduction by year 2000 in a workforce that numbered 59,000 in 1994. Noting tight budgets and shifting priorities, the report blithely asserts, "The Department has addressed these challenges through an ambitious set of reforms aiming at enhancing the strategic focus of the Department, cutting costs, and instituting management changes that improve performance." (Tell that to the Galvin Commission, whose recommendations for a real shakeup have been ignored.) Volume II contains 166 profiles, with budget data and program summaries, of DOE facilities and projects. Created last year, the 16-member Board is evenly divided between DOE and the private sector, and is chaired by Charles E. Curtis, Deputy Secretary of Energy; John P. McTague, Vice President, Technical Affairs, Ford Motor Co., is Vice Chair.

Order from: US Department of Energy, Public Inquiries Office, CP-41, Washington, DC 20585; tel. 202/586-5575.

From the National Science Foundation:

Impact of Emerging Technologies on the Biological Sciences (35 pp., no charge), summary of a workshop held last June by the NSF Directorate for Biological Sciences, reports lags in "largescale application of advanced technology" to biology, and urges life scientists and their federal supporters, in NSF, NIH and other agencies, to think big science. Cited as important are bioinformatics, computational biology, functional imaging using biosensors and biomarkers, transformation and transient expression technologies, and nanotechnologies. Forecasting "no growth or even reductions" in the NSF budget in "the next several years," the report calls for specialization in academic facilities with "purposeful omission of similar facilities at other universities" and "sunset clauses" on older facilities. The report also revives discredited fears of a shortage of scientists, declaring that improved job opportunities abroad are luring American-trained foreign graduates to their home countries. "This trend," it states, "will leave American university faculties and industries with a shortage of scientists." The workshop was chaired by Erich Bloch, the Paul Revere of the phantom scientist shortage during his 1984-90 tenure as Director of NSF. The cast of workshop participants did not include any postdocs.

Order from: National Science Foundation, BIO/BIR, Room 615, Arlington, Va. 22230; tel. 703/306-1469; fax 703/306-0356.

Advanced Technical Education: 1995 Awards and Activities (NSF 96-54; 89 pp., no charge), reports on the second year of an NSF program intended "for technicians being educated for the high performance workplace of advanced technologies." The program, spurred by White House concern for raising the skills of the blue-collar work force, allotted $23 million for 80 new and continuing projects, including new Centers for Excellence in Advanced Technological Education at Middlesex County College, New Jersey; Chemeketa Community College, Oregon, and Bellevue Community College, Washington. Also listed are awards for 36 new projects at institutions around the country, including Seminole College, Florida; Johns Hopkins University; the Wentworth Institute of Technology, Massachusetts, and the University of Texas, Austin.

Order from: NSF, Division of Undergraduate Education, Attn. DUE Information Center, Room 835, Arlington, Va. 22230; tel. 703/306-1666; fax 703/306-0445.

From the Secretary of Defense:

Proliferation: Threat and Response (GPO Stock No. 008-000-00683-1; 78 pp., price not yet available), released April 11 by Defense Secretary William Perry, surveys the world and finds a major potential for the acquisition of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons by outcast nations such as Libya, Iraq and North Korea, plus a few major states on the edge of the nuclear club, and criminal and terrorist organizations. "There has been a diffusion of the technologies that enable proliferation, a number of which have legitimate civilian applications and are inherently dual use," the report states. Examples cited include nuclear materials and skills on the loose in the former Soviet Union. Common industrial materials, the report adds, can be adapted to destructive purposes. Measures for countering the threat, the report says, include "involuntary" steps, as in the case of UN-enforced elimination of nuclear-weapons development in Iraq, international inspections, increased intelligence activities, etc.

Order from: US Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Mail Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-9328; tel. 202/512-1800; fax 202/512-2250.

From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:

Manufacturing Extension Programs (MEP): Manufacturer' Views About Delivery and Impact of Services (GAO/GGD-96-75; 54 pp.), says a survey of 551 firms drew generally favorable reports of their experiences with the MEP, financed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and state and local agencies. The program, modeled after the Agricultural extension system, has suffered some cuts, but has kept going, with the federal share rising to $104 million in 1995 from $66 million in 1994. The White House asked for $147 million for this fiscal year; the House and Senate agreed on $80 million in the budget adopted last week.

Going beyond the GAO report, it's notable that the treatment of MEP contrasts with Republican killer designs

(Continued on Page 7)